During the days of the Dies committeewhen Donner was a lawyer on the staff of the CIO and represented some of their members against who there were charges he borrowed some of my Dies files - and never returned them.

Mr. Frank Donner
30 Dock Road
South Norwalk, Conn. 06854

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
5/22/78

Dear Frank,

A copy of your Civil Liberties Review commentary on Lane's Code Name Zero has just reached me. I read the beginning with considerable respect, only to reach the end and find that in your casting or motes you could not purge your own eye.

You list Books About the King Assassination and you limit yourself to the sycophantic. This is not because you were unaware of the only one that is not in accord with the official explanation. In reading Lane's you read what he ripped off and then corrupted, my work as his source.

The record of the ACLU in general and liberal types in particular is no credit to the beliefs espoused. When I approached the ACLU for FOIA help in 1966 I never got a response. Then, when from nothing the ACLU had done FOIA was alive and well and when the subject of assassinations heated up lo! there was the ACLU to file suits for no other than Lane. And what suits! For what was readily available and had been published.

Your sermon from this mount debased the intellect and abandons respectable legal concepts. Whether or not any crime is a conspiracy is a question of fact, not of the opinion of well-paid whores. If you want the FBI's records relating to how it inspired and/or intended to inspire and nurture - even arrange - the books you praise, just ask.

If any of the assassinations was beyond the capability of a single person then you well know that there was a conspiracy. So you avoid any evidence and stake your integrity on the Bishops and McMillans and Franks of literary whoredom. In this you are totally contemptuous of evidence. You make no single reference to it.

You never heard of a corpus delicti? You can write as you have without a single reference to the Ray habeas corpus, the precedent (under Harris v Nelson) established in it? You know nothing of two weeks of evidentiary hearing in October 1974 and the evidence adduced and subjected to cross examination?

The thought may not please you but I assure you that this unbecoming, unnecessary and irrelevant addition to an otherwise excellent job is precisely the kind of think the spook/police-state mind plotted endlessly to accomplish. My files bulge with the virtually identical schemings of the CIA and the FBI.

What in the world drives decent people like you to such self-defamation, to such debasement of the mind? Are you hung up over Johnson's ~~thix~~ wiliness in putting the hat on Warren? On your own abdications in times of crisis?

Lane's book is even worse than you say. But I lament the fact that your own writing comes straight from the files of the FBI, almost exactly in the words of Cartha DeLoach, T.E.Bishop and many others, including the Founding Director himself.

In looking for your address I found my letter of 9/10/75. (Shortly after that I was hospitalized with acute thrombophlebitis in both legs and thighs. The damage is irreversible and has been followed by arterial impairment.) I find that I offered to be of help to you and that I suggested ways in which what I was doing could be helped. I offered to meet with you and to introduce you to the lawyer who was then handling my FOIA cases. He also handled the Ray evidentiary hearing. I find also that you knew how to reach me. So in addition to knowing about my work on the King assassination and in true ACLU tradition suppressing it in your review you also knew how you could have learned more about what was relevant in your writing. Instead you were dishonest and fell in step with the J. Edgar Hoovers of our society. I'm sorry,

Harold Weisberg